



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,804	07/27/2001	Yutaka Takeshima	P/1071-1392	2161

2352 7590 01/28/2003

OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 100368403

[REDACTED]

BARR, MICHAEL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1762	

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MK

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

8

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 707.07(f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____ . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter. (see NOTE below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

4. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):

5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

6. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Attachment

7. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

8. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: 1-14

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

9. The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ a) has b) has not been approved by the Examiner.

10. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

11. Other: _____

ADVISORY ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 1/22/03, have been fully considered and reviewed by the examiner. The applicant argues that Hayashi does not teach forming the oxide film at a temperature equal to or higher than the boiling point of the solvent. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The Hayashi reference specifically teaches that the drying and heating treatments are performed on the precursor liquid deposited to form the solid thin film (Col. 8, lines 19-24), and thus the teaching of heating the applied precursor to 200-500°C and then to 500-1000°C to form the oxide film (Col. 8, lines 36-57) reads on the claimed heating steps. These temperatures are above the boiling point of the solvents of Hayashi. Therefore, it is the examiner's position that Hayashi does teach the claimed heating conditions.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Specifically, the applicant refers to the heating vacuum limitations. However, Hayashi et al. teaches that the heat treatment occur while drawing a vacuum in the chamber (Col. 8, lines 37-64). One skilled in the art would have found it suggested to them that the pressure can be less in the chamber than during the deposition, in Hayashi et al., by such a teaching, and thus would have found such a vacuum application an

obvious modification to Hayashi et al., with the expectation of providing the desired heat treatment.

2. The applicant argues that Hayashi does not teach performing the film forming twice. The examiner agrees that Hayashi does not teach this feature, as indicated in the previous office action. However, the Solayappan has been provided to meet this deficiency.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Barr whose telephone number is 703-305-7919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00 am-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive Beck can be reached on 703-308-2333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 or 703-305-5408 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



Michael Barr
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762

MB
January 27, 2003